

Remarks

Claims 1-29 and 32-26 were pending. Claims 1, 10, 18, and 29 have been amended while claims 4, 24, 30, and 31 have been cancelled. Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

103 Rejections

Claims 1-6, 10-12, 15, 17-18, 24-32, and 35-36 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin (US 2002/0049788) in view of Bradley (US 2002/0194219). Claims 7-9 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin in view of Bradley and further in view of Wang (US 2002/003547). Claims 13-33 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin in view of Bradley and in further view of Chrisfort (US 2002/0078168). Claims 12, 27, and 32 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin in view of Chrisfort and further in view of Chen (US 2003/0018694). Claims 14, 16, 19-23, and 34 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lipkin in view of Bradley and further in view of Ridgley (US Pat 6,583,800). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

The claims now introduce that the data is saved in a portable document format contemporaneously with the saving of the data in XML format via an XSL construct. Furthermore, the claims now introduce that saving the data in XML format via the XSL construct occurs by accessing the data from a software program that saves the data in the portable document format but not in XML format where access occurs via a script-based plug-in. The specification provides an example of a Javascript plug-in used to access the XFDF data from the Adobe Acrobat software program such that the XSLT may be applied to create the XML file from the XFDF data. The claims now also introduce the closing of the portable document format file and the XML file and then re-opening of the portable document format file to edit the data and then save the edits to replace the portable document format file and saving the edits in XML format via the XSL to replace the XML file.

As a representative example, amended claim 1 recites a method of creating extensible and repurposable content. The method comprises creating a document type definition (DTD), generating a form-based data entry interface based, at least in part, on

the DTD, wherein the form-based data entry interface is implemented as a portable document format accessible via a portable document format compatible application program that is incapable of saving data in the form of extensible markup language (XML) and inputting data into the form-based data entry interface that is accessible via the application program. Claim 1 further recites applying an extensible stylesheet language (XSL) construct to the data that is input at step (c) by accessing the form-based data entry interface via a script based plug-in to the application program, through application of the XSL, saving the data in the form of XML consistent with the DTD to produce a first XML file while contemporaneously saving the data in the form in the portable document format to produce a first portable document format file, and after saving the data and closing the form-based data entry interface, accessing the form-based data entry interface and data in the portable document format via the portable document format compatible application program. Additionally, claim 1 recites editing the data through the form-based data entry interface via the application program, re-applying the XSL construct to the edited data by again accessing the form-based data entry interface via the script based plug-in to the application program, and through application of the XSL, saving the edited data in the form of XML consistent with the DTD to replace the first XML file while contemporaneously saving the edited data in the form in the portable document format to replace the first portable document format file.

None of the cited references, taken singly or in combination, disclose this combination of recitations as recited in claim 1. Furthermore, independent claims 10, 18, and 29 recite similar recitations that the cited references also fail to disclose when taken singly or in combination. Accordingly, claims 1, 10, 18 and 29 are allowable over the cited references for at least these reasons. Dependent claims 2, 3, 5-9, 11-17, 19-23, 25-28, and 32-36 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable at least for the same reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1- and -36 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments

and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due beyond the fee for continued examination and a one month extension of time. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 22, 2005



Jeramie J. Keys
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355
(404) 849.2093